

Date: Fri, 16 Apr 93 04:30:12 PDT  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #471  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Fri, 16 Apr 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 471

Today's Topics:

                    "Busting" Jammers  
                    Reorg should include r.r.a.antennas

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: 16 Apr 1993 01:43:10 -0400  
From: umcc!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: "Busting" Jammers  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc  
Subject: Re: Want Jammer in Slammer  
Summary:  
Expires:  
References: <734345121.AA00756@his.com> <1993Apr9.165907.660000@cc.usu.edu>  
<LINNIG.93Apr14160458@m2000.dseg.ti.com>  
Sender:  
Followup-To:  
Distribution:  
Organization: UMCC, Ann Arbor, MI  
Keywords:

In article <LINNIG.93Apr14160458@m2000.dseg.ti.com> linnig@m2000.dseg.ti.com (Mike Linnig) writes:  
>In article <1993Apr9.165907.660000@cc.usu.edu> slp9m@cc.usu.edu (Scott E. Parker WA7VYJ) writes:

>  
>> The first thing to do is for all involved in the hunt (the more the merrier) to  
>> go knock on the guy's door and have a group spokesman politely tell him  
>> something on the order of, "we know what you do and we know who you are".  
>> Doesn't always work, but it has in a number of cases. It's worth a try before  
>> resorting to more drastic measures.  
>  
>It should be particularly effective if you know a ham who is also a police  
>officer and let him be the spokesman (in uniform if possible).  
>

To be succinct, the advice about confronting the person is garbage.  
Certainly most police who are hams would also be smart enough not to get  
involved in a federal matter in most cases.

If the person confronted actually was the one creating the malicious  
interference, he/she might stop, but it is also quite likely that they will  
deny it, & then make sure that the interference continues (perhaps from a  
different location, & with the jammer being more cautious) in order to  
'prove you wrong' (the logic being that most people would assume confronting  
the individual would stop the problem -- if the problem persists, maybe the  
confronted individual was innocent...).

If you get on the air & say "We tracked that jammer down! It is  
Wilbur Smith, KA7xxx that is interfering with the repeater!" you run the  
strong risk of being sued, and it is really irrelevant as to whether or not  
it was Wilbur that was doing the interference.

The thing to do is simply provide all your information to a local  
ARRL Official Observer, & let them funnel it to the FCC.

A lot of times, the FCC can't/won't do anything right away, but if  
the complaints & evidence persist, eventually they will get involved.  
They'll probably use the information you've provided as a start, & then  
they will come out with their \$30,000 - \$80,000 worth of electronic  
equipment, & gather evidence which will actually stand up in court.

THEY can hold their own ground in court. How well do you think any  
of us could do on the stand, under cross-examination, & being asked just  
what exactly makes us experts at RDF, emitter signatures, etc?

We do it as a hobby. Most of our equipment & RDF techniques are  
sound, but again, we're 'amateurs.'

The FCC are professionals. Many of their field engineers would be  
happy to explain to you that the only real difference between our \$1000 Icom  
R-7100s & their \$25,000 Watkins-Johnson communications receivers is that  
THEIR equipment holds up in court a lot better than ours would...

>Mike Linnig, Texas Instruments Inc. | 97.43% of all statistics are made |

--

Tim Tyler           Internet: tim@ais.org   MCI Mail: 442-5735   GEnie: T.Tyler5  
P.O. Box 443        C\$erve: 72571,1005   DDN: Tyler@Dockmaster.ncsc.mil  
Ypsilanti MI        Packet: KA8VIR @WB8ZPN.#SEMI.MI.USA.NA  
48197

-----  
Date: Thu, 15 Apr 93 20:58:30 PDT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!newsserver.jvnc.net!darwin.sura.net!emory!  
sol.ctr.columbia.edu!destroyer!cs.ubc.ca!mala.bc.ca!oneb!ham!emd@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Reorg should include r.r.a.antennas  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In the discussion to date, very little has been said about what I consider to be a significant subset of amateur discussion, namely antennas. While I consider it significant, others may not.

Can someone with a longer expire time on his news spool estimate the number of articles per month on antennas? I presume Ian or someone has already done the calculations.

In my view, r.r.a.antennae (antennas?) ought to include discussion of all kinds of antennas, both theory and construction, and also designs and design programs for antennas. Reviewing the latest program to design your own log-periodic, for example, ought to be covered.

Anyone else for r.r.a.antennas?

Robert Smits                               There is \*no\* idiotproof filter.  
VE7EMD                                     Idiots are proof against anything!  
Ladysmith B.C.                            - Richard Chycoski, VE7CVS  
e-mail: emd@ham.almanac.bc.ca

-----  
End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #471  
\*\*\*\*\*